

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/083,413	02/27/2002	Avraham J. Domb	Q63391	7369	
7	7590 02/17/2004		EXAMINER		
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			FLOOD, MICHELE C		
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue Washington, DC 20037-3213			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
, 			1654		
			DATE MAILED: 02/17/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/083,413	DOMB ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Michele C. Flood	1654				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 26 November 2003 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a tion in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amounthe shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>26 November 2003</u> . 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			t forth in			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NO	T place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were	e newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:			,			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>13,14,18,20,21,24 and 25</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-12,15-17,19,22,23 and 26</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·				
10. ☑ Other: See attached "Interview Summary".	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\sim				
		CHRISTOPHE PRIMARY EX				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The prior art of Talpolsky and/or Roreger anticipate and/or are at least obvious over the pending claims. Moreover, with regard to the teachings of Roreger et al., Applicant's arguments are neither persuasive nor commensurate in scope to the limitations of the claimed invention.